

REMARKS

In the September 7, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 2 and 4-6 were pending in the application; rejected claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a); and allowed claims 1, 2, 4 and 5. Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 remain in the case. The rejection is traversed below.

In items 1 and 2 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patents 5,696,764 to Soumiya et al. and 6,438,732 to Kalliojarvi (References A and B, respectively in the September 7, 2006 Office Action). In item 3 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 were allowed. Therefore, claim 6 has been amended to use wording similar to the limitations previously recited in claim 1, specifically, "generating redundant equal-sized packets, each having a length equal to a longest one of the data packets, by filling with known padding data and then converting the equal-sized data packets into redundancy packets by coding" (claim 6, lines 4-6) and "after converting the received data packets into equal-sized reconstructed data packets, by filling with the known padding data" (claim 6, last 3 lines).

As a result of the amendments it submitted that claim 6 patentably distinguishes over the prior art used in rejecting the claims for the reasons recognized by the Examiner in allowing claim 1. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Entry of Amendment

It is submitted that the limitations added to claim 6 are sufficiently similar to those previously recited in claim 1 that no new search should be required. Therefore, entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Request for Examiner Interview Prior to Next Office Action

If the amendments made to claim 6 do not result in allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange an Interview prior to issuing another Office Action, for the purpose of discussing what further amendments are required to have claim 6 allowed along with claims 1, 2, 4 and 5.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claim 6, in addition to claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 which were previously allowed, is in a condition suitable for allowance. Entry of

the Amendment, reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 7, 2006

By: /Richard A. Gollhofer/
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501